

Art Unit: 2839

Remarks/Arguments

In paragraph 1 of the Action, the abstract of the disclosure was objected to because of the legalistic language used.

In reply thereto, applicant respectfully traverses the objection because the abstract does not use the legalistic language such as "means" and "said" described in MPEP S.608.01(b).

In paragraph 2 of the Action, a new title was required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

In reply thereto, applicant has amended the title to -ELECTRICAL CONNECTOR WITH LOCK AND SHIELD PIECES IN MIDDLE PLANE- which applicant believes is clearly indicative of the invention.

In paragraph 3 of the Action, claim 8 was objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c).

In reply thereto, applicant has amended claim 8 so as to refer to other claims in the alternative only and respectfully requests that it be treated on the merits.

In paragraphs 4-5 of the Action, claims 1 and 5-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Murr et al.

In reply thereto, applicant has amended claim 1 to define applicant's invention more clearly over the prior art of record.

As clearly defined in claim 1, applicant's invention comprises a pair of shield pieces provided on opposite sides of the resilient lock piece so as to extend in parallel to the resilient lock piece from the bending portion toward the inner portion and then toward the front

Art Unit: 2839

opening of the rectangular case in the substantially same plane as that of the resilient lock piece.

With respect to the prior art, Murr discloses an electrical connector assembly utilizing multiple ground planes, which includes ground contacts 128 formed integral with the bottom 120 and project forward, upward and into the opening 127 in the front face 122 and ground contacts 130 located near the rear end of the sides 118.

However, Murr neither discloses nor suggests any pair of shield pieces provided on opposite sides of the lock piece to extend in parallel to the lock piece from the bending portion toward the inner portion and then toward the front opening of the rectangular case in the substantially same plane as that of the lock piece.

For this reason, it is submitted that claim 1 is patentable over Murr et al.

In paragraphs 6-7 of the Action, claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murr et al as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Yang.

In reply thereto, applicant has amended the base claim and believes that claim 2 is patentable over Murr et al in view of Yang for the same reasons as set forth above with respect to claim 1.

In paragraph 8 of the Action, claims 3-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murr et al as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Yeh.

In reply thereto, applicant has amended the base claim and believes that claims 3-4 are patentable over Murr et al in view of Yeh for the reasons as set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Art Unit: 2839

In paragraph 9 of the Action, claim 9 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

In reply thereto, applicant has amended the base claim and believes that claim 9 is patentable over the prior art of record for the same reasons as set forth above with respect to claim 1.

The prior art made of record but not relied upon does not appear to be any more pertinent with respect to the amended claims.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that this application be reconsidered, claims 1-9 allowed, and this case passed to issue.

A change of corresponding address was filed on August 12, 2004.

Respectfully submitted,



By Yusuke Takeuchi

Reg. No. 30,921

Tel. (703) 684-9777